IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SRI INTERNATIONAL, INC., a California Corporation,

Plaintiff and Counterclaim-Defendant,

v.

INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., a Delaware corporation, INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., a Georgia corporation, and SYMANTEC CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Defendants and o Counterclaim-Plaintiffs.

PUBLIC VERSION

Civil Action No. 04-CV-1199 (SLR)

LETTER TO THE HONORABLE SUE L. ROBINSON DATED MAY 13, 2008

OF COUNSEL:
Paul S. Grewal
Renee Dubord Brown
Geoffrey M. Godfrey
DAY, CASEBEER MADRID &
BATCHELDER LLP
20300 Stevens Creek Blvd.,
Suite 400
Cupertino, CA 95014
Tel: (408) 873-0110

MORRIS JAMES LLP Richard K. Herrmann (#405) Mary B. Matterer (#2696) 500 Delaware Avenue, 15th Floor Wilmington, DE 19801 Tel.: (302) 888-6800 rherrmann@morrisjames.com mmatterer@morrisjames.com

Attorneys for Defendant Symantec Corporation

Original Version Date: May 13, 2008 Redacted Version Date: May 20, 2008

Morris James LLP

Richard K. Herrmann 302.888.6816 rherrmann@morrisjames.com

May 13, 2008

FILED UNDER SEAL

VIA E-FILING AND HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Sue L. Robinson United States District Court District of Delaware 844 King Street Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Re: SRI International v. ISS and Symantec, D. Del., C.A. No. 04-1199-SLR

Your Honor:

Symantec submits this letter in response to the Court's request at the April 29, 2008 status conference that the parties submit copies of those portions of the record pertaining to the two summary judgment issues that the Court has agreed to rule upon.¹

The documents identified below and attached as exhibits to this letter concern Defendants' position that the *EMERALD 1997* reference in combination with its internally-cited reference *Intrusive Activity 1991* rendered obvious all of the asserted claims of the '203 and '615 patents. ISS will submit a separate letter concerning its position that the asserted claims of the '338 patent were anticipated by the *JiNao* reference.

The combination of *EMERALD 1997* and *Intrusive Activity 1991* was originally addressed in the Joint Motion of Defendants ISS and Symantec for Summary Judgment of Invalidity Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 (D.I. 297), which is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Relevant portions of Defendants' opening brief in support of their motion (D.I. 299) are attached as Exhibit B. Relevant portions of Defendants' reply brief in support of their motion (D.I. 400) are attached as Exhibit C. The documents cited in those two briefs were previously submitted as exhibits to the Declaration of Renee DuBord Brown (D.I. 301) and the Declaration of Geoffrey M. Godfrey (D.I. 402). The relevant portions of those declarations are attached as Exhibits D and E, respectively.²

¹ See 4/28/2008 Hearing Tr. (Docket Item ("D.I. 499")) at 28-32.

Defendants have not attached copies of documents that were cited only in the background section of their opening brief (D.I. 299 at 6-10).

The Honorable Sue L. Robinson May 13, 2008 Page 2



The combination of EMERALD 1997 and Intrusive Activity 1991 was also addressed in Symantec's April 25, 2008 letter to the Court (D.I. 500), and during the April 29, 2008 status conference (D.I. 499 at 6-12). Symantec does not understand the Court to have requested copies of those most recent parts of the record, but we would be pleased to provide copies if that would be of assistance to the Court.

Symantec continues to appreciate the Court's attention to these matters.

Respectfully,

/s/ Richard K. Herrmann

Richard K. Herrmann, I.D. No. 405 rherrmann@morrisjames.com

RKH/tp

cc: Dr. Peter T. Dalleo, Clerk of the Court (via hand delivery) John Horvath, Esq. (via email) Howard G. Pollack, Esq. (via email) Richard L. Horwitz, Esq. (via email) David Moore, Esq. (via email) Holmes Hawkins, III, Esq. (via email)